

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the Office Action is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 15 to 31 are presently in the application.

The informalities in the specification have been corrected, and proposed drawing corrections which address the matters raised in the Office Action are attached.

The present invention is directed to a connection device for attaching to a receiver rail of a weapon which is quick to operate, and results in a secure, consistent, and robust attachment. Additionally, it does not have any parts which protrude laterally from the weapon.

Claims 1 to 3 stand rejected as being anticipated by Amelino U.S. Patent No. 5,570,529 under 35 USC 102. This rejection, as it applies to the amended and new claims presented herewith is respectfully traversed.

Amelino is directed to a connection device which uses a rotatable knob to move a clamp jaw rather than a quick acting cam. Thus, operation is considerably slower than with the present invention, and valuable time may be lost in making the attachment. Amelino includes a torque limiting mechanism wherein as the knob is turned, inclined knob ramp 72 rides against inclined nut ramp 58 to a point where the knob axial step 78 falls over the nut axial step 64.

Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations which are neither anticipated nor obvious over Amelino. Claim 1 now recites that the bolt which pulls and pushes the clamp between extended and retracted positions has an axial direction and the cam which moves the bolt is rotatable in a plane in which the axial direction of the bolt lies.

On the other hand, in Amelino, the knob is rotatable in a plane which is perpendicular to the axial direction of the bolt, and the inclined ramps are rotatable in planes which are diagonal to the axial direction of the bolt. Hence, claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Amelino. Additionally, the claim is not obvious because it is clearly not apparent how Amelino could be structurally modified to produce an operable device having the claimed subject matter.

Dependent claims 15 to 30, and independent claim 31 add further patentable subject matter. Thus, claim 15 recites that the cam works against the stationary member of the clamp while in Amelino any such structure works against the movable side of the clamp. Additionally, claim 17 recites that the extended and retracted positions of the clamp are the only stable

positions, while in Amelino, rotation of the knob produces many stable positions. It is hence submitted that all claims presently in the application are patentable over Amelino.

All but one of the original claims of the application also stand rejected as being as the anticipated by Waterman U.S. Patent No. 6,442,883, or as being obvious over this patent. Applicants have herewith filed a Declaration of the inventors under 37 C.F.R.1.131 which removes the Waterman patent as a reference.

The filing date of the Waterman patent is March 20, 2000, and the Rule 131 Declaration establishes that the claimed invention was reduced to practice much before that date. As detailed in the Declaration, the invention was conceived by inventors John Nelson and Stephen Lesniowski, an actual embodiment was built by Mr. Lesniowski, and the actual embodiment was tested successfully by Mr. Nelson much before March 20, 2000.


Exhibit C is a group of photographs which depict an example of the embodiment which was built and tested. Photographs from Exhibit C were part of a Record of Invention which was submitted by the inventors, so the features disclosed and claimed in the application are shown in the photographs. These features are also shown in drawings made by Mr. Nelson, i.e., Exhibit A, and by Mr. Lesniowski, i.e., Exhibit E (dates redacted). Testing of the invention was performed by Mr. Nelson at Shrewsbury Machine, New Castle, Virginia, where there was a rifle range (Declaration, Par. 8). The test occurred much before March 20, 2000 and its purpose was to see if the connection device would shake loose during the firing of a weapon on which it was mounted. The test was successful in that the mount remained securely in place during the firing of the weapon, hence the invention was reduced to practice.

Because it was discovered that two of the named inventors in the application (Messrs. Buchanan and Nevarez) were actually not inventors of the subject matter claimed herein, filed herewith are Statement of Harrison Lewis Buchanan Under 37 C.F.R.1.48, Declaration and Power To Prosecute of inventors Nelson and Lesniowski, Consent of Assignee Under 37 C.F.R.1.48, and Statement of Hector Nevarez Under 37 C.F.R.1.48 (signed copy will follow), the effect of which is to delete Messrs. Buchanan and Nevarez as inventors.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration of the application as well as the issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Dated: August 9, 2004

EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC
CUSTOMER NO. 27896
1901 Research Boulevard, Suite 400
Rockville, MD 20850
(301) 424-3640

Respectfully submitted by
EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC
By: 
Martin Abramson
Reg. No. 25,787